

U.S. Pat. App. No.: 09/841,974  
Atty. Docket No.: 003921.00011

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

Applicant has attached hereto three sheets of drawings with proposed changes marked thereon. In particular, Applicant has attached a sheet with Figure 1 having an additional item indicator 100 marked thereon, and a sheet with Figure 2 having an additional item indicator 200 marked thereon. Applicant also has amended these figures to change the term "bar" to -- point--. Further, Applicant has attached a new Figure 3 illustrating features of the invention recited in claim 3. The Examiner's approval of these proposed drawing changes is respectfully requested.

U.S. Pat. App. No.: 09/841,974  
Atty. Docket No.: 003921.00011

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully asks for reconsideration of both this application and the Office Action dated November 12, 2004. A response to this Office Action was due by February 12, 2005. Accordingly, Applicant is concurrently filing a Petition for a three month extension of time, together with authorization for the Commissioner to charge the associated Petition fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0733. Please consider this Amendment as timely filed.

Applicants gratefully thanks the Examiner for the personal interview granted on April 19, 2005. This Amendment is presented in accordance with the substance of that interview.

In the Office Action, the Examiner first objected to the drawings for failing to show various features of the invention recited in claims 3-7, 15, 16, 18, and 19. The Examiner also objected to the drawings for using a term (i.e., "cross bar") that was inconsistent with the corresponding term used in the specification (i.e., "cross point"). Applicant respectfully traverses these objections, but courteously point out that they are moot. First, Applicant is submitting amended Figures 1 and 2 that employ the term "cross point" rather than "cross bar."

Applicant also is submitting new Figure 3, which illustrates the noted features recited in claims 3-7, 15, 16, 18, and 19. In support of this new Figure 3, Applicant also has amended the specification to identify the features it illustrates. Applicants respectfully submit that neither the new figure nor the amendments to the specification present new matter, as this drawing and the associated text added to the specification only describe subject matter recited in the originally filed claims. Applicants therefore request approval of the drawing changes submitted herein, and ask that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

U.S. Pat. App. No.: 09/841,974  
Atty. Docket No.: 003921.00011

Lastly, claims 1-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 over EPO Patent Application No. EP 1 043 662 A1 to Boles in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,377,911 to Sample et al., in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,282,503 to Okazaki et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, and asks for its reconsideration.

Claims 1-7 and 14-19 are directed to an emulator that serializes and then deserializes data to transfer that data from a first logic device to a second logic device during a circuit emulation process. To further emphasize this subject, claims 1-7 and 14-19 are amended herein to recite that the first programmable logic device is configured to emulate a first partition of a circuit, and the second programmable logic device is configured to emulate a second partition of the circuit. Similarly, claims 8-13 and 20-24 are directed to a method of emulating a circuit by serializing and then deserializing data transferred from a first logic device to a second logic device during the circuit emulation process. As discussed in detail during the interview, no combination of the Boles application, the Sample et al. patent and the Okazaki et al. patent would teach or suggest these features of the invention.

The Boles application describes a method of allowing a function circuit 12 to have access to multiple pin locations P1 and P2. It does not teach or suggest a process to emulate a circuit, or a structure configured to emulate a circuit. The portion of the Sample et al. relied upon by the Examiner, on the other hand, is directed to the configuration of programmable gate arrays to perform an emulation process, and not to the use of a serializer and deserializer for the emulation process itself. Applicant further submits that the Okazaki et al. patent does not remedy these omissions of the Boles application and the Sample et al. patent.

U.S. Pat. App. No.: 09/841,974  
Atty. Docket No.: 003921.00011

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that no combination of the Boles application, the Sample et al. patent and the Okazaki et al. patent would teach or suggest these features of the invention recited in any of claims 1-24. It is therefore requested that the rejection of these claims over the combination of the Boles application, the Sample et al. patent and the Okazaki et al. patent be withdrawn.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be necessary to maintain the pendency of this application, including any fees under 37 C.F.R. §1.16 or §1.17, to Deposit Account No. 19-0733.

Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims are allowable, and that this application therefore is in condition for allowance. Applicant courteously asks for favorable action regarding this Amendment at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

By: Thomas L. Evans  
Thomas L. Evans, Reg. No. 35,805  
1001 G Street, N.W., 11<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597  
Telephone: (202) 824-3000  
Facsimile: (202) 824-3001

May 12, 2005